

Development Control Committee Supplementary Schedule

Containing information received
since the distribution of the
main schedule of applications

23rd November 2018

Consultee Comments for application 18/0359

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0359

Address: Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Proposal: Change of Use Of Former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Retrospective/Revised Application)

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Allison Riddell

Address: Unit 2 Old Brewery Yard Craw Hall, Brampton CA8 1TR

Email: bramptonpc@googlemail.com

On Behalf Of: Brampton Parish Council

Comments

Members of Brampton Parish Council would only agree a retail application on condition that the applicant can prove he has been allocated all the designated spaces shown in the rear of the Brewery yard on the application.

Consultee Comments for application 18/0359

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0359

Address: Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Proposal: Change of Use Of Former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Retrospective/Revised Application)

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Allison Riddell

Address: Unit 2 Old Brewery Yard Craw Hall, Brampton CA8 1TR

Email: bramptonpc@googlemail.com

On Behalf Of: Clerk to Brampton PC, Unit 2 - The Old Brewery

Comments

Members cannot support this application as there is no evidence of the required parking spaces in perpetuity for the unit to trade as a retail unit.

Further comments -

1 - the submitted parking layout plan is misleading as the spaces do not exist per the plan. Most are taken up by other tenants in the brewery yard, are not legal or block fire exits.

2 - The current use of the unit is light industrial (B1/B2/B8) not D2 as stated. Historically the unit has been industrial but was changed to D2 briefly when used as a gym in 2015/16. The use was reverted back to industrial under planning application 16/0775.

3 - Members support the recent application for a single yellow line outside units 5&7 on Craw Hall to alleviate parking problems in the area. Double yellow lines at the junction of Craw Hall/Millfield have already been agreed with highways.

Consultee Comments for Planning Application 18/0359

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0359

Address: Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Proposal: Change of Use Of Former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Retrospective/Revised Application)

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Consultee Details

Name: Mrs Allison Riddell

Address: Unit 2 Old Brewery Yard Craw Hall, Brampton CA8 1TR

Email: bramptonpc@googlemail.com

On Behalf Of: Clerk to Brampton PC, Unit 2 - The Old Brewery

Comments

Members resolved that they were not in a position to make a meaningful observation on the sequential test and therefore have no further observations.

From:Allan, Peter T
Sent:6 Jun 2018 10:48:12 +0100
To:ED Admin Team
Cc:DM&LLFA East;Richard Maunsell
Subject:18/0359 - Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Dear Richard,

Thank you for the consultation on the above planning application, which was received on 21 May 2018.

The consultation is in relation to the change of use of former gym to warehouse/retail shop (retrospective/revised application) at Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR.

Highways Authority Response:

The Highways Authority have been in discussions with the applicant since the original planning application (17/0549). It was stated throughout the consultation that the parking requirement for an individual shop is 8 car parking spaces, 1 disabled space, 1 motorcycle and 2 pedal cycle spaces. These parking requirements were to be provided by the applicant but not to the detriment of other business users in the vicinity.

Discussions took place with the applicant to determine if the applicant could provide these parking requirements within the courtyard to the rear of the Old Brewery. In principle this is accepted by the Highways Authority; however a written agreement is required from the landlord that Unit 11 may use the rear yard in perpetuity for car parking and that the provision for Unit 11 would not affect the parking requirements for other business users.

Within the current application the plans submitted illustrate that 10 car parking spaces are to be provided within the rear court yard of the Old Brewery. However no dimensions of the car parking spaces have been provided (should be 2.6m x 5m) along with a written agreement with the landlord for the use of the courtyard to be used for

parking in perpetuity for Unit 11 and an assessment of if the parking provision for Unit 11 will negatively affect other businesses in the vicinity.

In light of this the Highways Authority recommends this application for refusal due to insufficient information being submitted with regards to the parking arrangements for the development.

Lead Local Flood Authority Response:

The Lead Local Flood Authority have no objections to the proposals as it is considered that they will not affect flood risk on site or downstream of the development.

Kind regards,

Peter Allan

Flood & Development Management Officer
Flood & Development Management

Environment & Regulatory Services | Cumbria County Council

Parkhouse Building| Baron Way | Carlisle | CA6 4SJ

t: 07884116818

www.cumbria.gov.uk

This e-mail contains confidential information (which may also be legally privileged) and is intended solely for the use of the intended named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any part of this message or its attachments. If you

have received this message in error please notify the originator immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software. Incoming and outgoing emails may be monitored in line with current legislation. All copies of the message received in error should be destroyed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the original author. This email message has been scanned for viruses, and declared to be virus free at the point of exit from Cumbria County Council's network. <http://www.cumbria.gov.uk/>

From:Allan, Peter T
Sent:16 Jul 2018 08:57:28 +0100
To:ED Admin Team
Cc:DM&LLFA East;Richard Maunsell
Subject:18/0359 - Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Dear Richard,

Thank you for the consultation on the above planning application, which was received on 22 June 2018.

The consultation is in relation to the change of use of former gym to warehouse/retail shop (retrospective/revised application) at Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR.

Highways Authority Response:

The Highways Authority have been in discussions with the applicant since the original planning application (17/0549). It was stated throughout the consultation that the parking requirement for an individual shop is 8 car parking spaces, 1 disabled space, 1 motorcycle and 2 pedal cycle spaces. These parking requirements were to be provided by the applicant but not to the detriment of other business users in the vicinity.

Discussions took place with the applicant to determine if the applicant could provide these parking requirements within the courtyard to the rear of the Old Brewery. In principle this is accepted by the Highways Authority; however a written agreement is required from the landlord that Unit 11 may use the rear yard in perpetuity for car parking and that the provision for Unit 11 would not affect the parking requirements for other business users.

Within the revised parking plan as submitted on the 28 June 2018 there is enough room for 15 car parking spaces within the courtyard with a dimension of 2.6m x 4.8m. Eight of these spaces are to be allocated towards the Old Brewery which would leave a provision of 7 for the remaining businesses. This is an unacceptable allowance for the other business users within the area and would result in vehicles parking at the front of

the development and blocking the footway. Also as stated previously, no written agreement with the landlord for the use of the courtyard to be used for parking in perpetuity for Unit 11 has been submitted.

In light of this the Highways Authority recommends this application for refusal due to the Local Planning Authority considering that in the absence of adequate on-site parking space, the proposed development would be likely to result in vehicles being parked outside the site on the county highway to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety.

To support Local Transport Plan Policy: LD7, LD8

Kind regards,

Peter Allan

Flood & Development Management Officer
Flood & Development Management

Environment & Regulatory Services | Cumbria County Council

Parkhouse Building| Baron Way | Carlisle | CA6 4SJ

t: 07884116818

www.cumbria.gov.uk

This e-mail contains confidential information (which may also be legally privileged) and is intended solely for the use of the intended named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any part of this message or its attachments. If you have received this message in error please notify the originator immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software. Incoming and outgoing emails may be monitored in line with current legislation. All copies of the message received in error should be destroyed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the original author. This email message has been

scanned for viruses, and declared to be virus free at the point of exit from Cumbria County Council's network. <http://www.cumbria.gov.uk/>

From:Allan, Peter T
Sent:Thu, 1 Nov 2018 09:02:13 +0000
To:ED Admin Team
Cc:DM&LLFA East;Richard Maunsell
Subject:18/0359 - Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Dear Richard,

Thank you for the consultation on the above planning application, which was received on 13 October 2018.

The consultation is in relation to the change of use of former gym to warehouse/retail shop (retrospective/revised application) at Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR.

Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority Response:

As part of the latest consultation on this site a sequential test has been submitted regarding the siting of the used furniture shop. I can confirm that the Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the proposed sequential test as it not a document that can be commented upon as it does not affect the highway or flood risk on site. However it should be noted that the previous comments from the Highways Authority dated 17 July 2018 still apply,

Kind regards,

Peter Allan

Flood & Development Management Officer
Flood & Development Management

Environment & Regulatory Services | Cumbria County Council

Parkhouse Building| Baron Way | Carlisle | CA6 4SJ

t: 07884116818

www.cumbria.gov.uk

This e-mail contains confidential information (which may also be legally privileged) and is intended solely for the use of the intended named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you may not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any part of this message or its attachments. If you have received this message in error please notify the originator immediately by using the reply facility in your e-mail software. Incoming and outgoing emails may be monitored in line with current legislation. All copies of the message received in error should be destroyed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the original author. This email message has been scanned for viruses, and declared to be virus free at the point of exit from Cumbria County Council's network. <http://www.cumbria.gov.uk/>

OVERALL COMMENT: this Sequential 'Test' is incomplete, misleading and has inaccuracies.

- It is not true that the distance from Unit 11 to edge of town centre is only 330 metres; measurement on the ground gives **410 metres**. It is an "out of centre" development, not in accordance with the local plan: and as such a Transport Assessment or Statement is needed for Impacts on traffic, and elderly and handicapped persons. (CDDG, Appendix 3 – Criteria).
- No comment that this disproportionate out-of-scale retail development in this location will reduce vitality and viability of town centre, by attracting away customers from the town centre.
- No comment that Industrial rates (£28 sqm) undercut town Retail rates (£120+).
- No comment on Unit 11's almost complete lack of required provision of 'off-road' forecourt parking; minimum 8 spaces required for a retail shop development of this size (239 sq.m.); nor that Courtyard private parking 200 m distance not considered "credible" by Planning Officer, RM.
- Alternative Customer parking on highway does not remove this 'off-road' parking requirement.
- **Conclusion: this out-of-scale/ out-of-town-centre retail development location is unsuitable.**

FURTHER COMMENTS**1. S/T argues that Lowther needs "passing traffic":**

'Capernaum' (his best town centre option) has **same 'passing traffic'** as Unit 11, on B6413.
- with great extra advantage of providing further customers from its town centre location.

2. S/T argues that 'Capernaum' car parking in front might impede re-stocking shop:

1. Accepted restocking of goods practice for town centre premises, is to load and unload outside of working hours (9-5pm) when front public car parking areas are usually empty.
2. 'Capernaum' has public off-road car parking to front; and large private car parking to rear.
3. Existing industrial Unit 11. warehouse could be retained to supply Capernaum shop.

3. S/T argues that Capernaum has unsuitable, "domestic-sized" doorway entrances.

1. Not true. Normal 'domestic-sized' entrance is **32 ins width** (accepting wheelchair access).
2. 'Capernaum' has two entrances, **both 36 ins width**; both level entry, for handicap access.
3. Compare this with Castlegate Shop: front door 34 ins; Abbey Antiques: front door 34 ins;

4. S/T argues that Capernaum ground floor space is limited for "bulky" items use; and that stairways are 'narrow' and 'insufficient width' for taking bulky items upstairs.

1. Not true. It is normal practice for all used-furniture businesses to operate out of ordinary domestic or shop premises, with ordinary-width stairs, up which they can manoeuvre bulky items. There is no reason why Lowther cannot do the same here. (Restaurant had no problems with customers proceeding upstairs).
2. **Ground floor** with open-plan dining and bar area (83 sq.m) **exceeds the 75 sqm. shop area presently being applied for in Unit 11.** (Upstairs open-plan dining area adds extra).

5. S/T argues that refurbishment from former use as a restaurant would be 'cost prohibitive', and the premises would 'require to be rewired throughout'.

1. Not true. Refurbishment of dining areas would not be prohibitive. Normal practice for a kitchen area would to leave it as it is, and (either) place used-furniture on drapes over tables and side fittings; (or) preferably, use kitchen to open a coffee area to entice in passing trade and to encourage sales.
2. Not true needs rewiring. No evidence of electric wiring needing to be rewired throughout.
6. Not true. That former Omega and Geltsdale Carpets premises are withdrawn from offers.
Former Omega Landlord has stated he undertakes to pay for all refurbishments to bring it up to date.

Comments for Planning Application 18/0359

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0359

Address: Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Proposal: Change of Use Of Former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Retrospective/Revised Application)

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:

CRITIQUE OF (SECOND) LOWTHER SEQUENTIAL TEST (9 Nov) Application 18/0359

OVERALL COMMENT: this Sequential 'Test' is incomplete, misleading and has inaccuracies.

- It is not true that the distance from Unit 11 to edge of town centre is only 330 metres; measurement on the ground gives 410 metres. It is an "out of centre" development, not in accordance with the local plan: and as such a Transport Assessment or Statement is needed for Impacts on traffic, and elderly and handicapped persons. (CDDG, Appendix 3 - Criteria).
- No comment that this disproportionate out-of-scale retail development in this location will reduce vitality and viability of town centre, by attracting away customers from the town centre.
- No comment that Industrial rates (£28 sqm) undercut town Retail rates (£120+).
- No comment on Unit 11's almost complete lack of required provision of 'off-road' forecourt parking; minimum 8 spaces required for a retail shop development of this size (239 sq.m.); nor that Courtyard private parking 200 m distance not considered "credible" by Planning Officer, RM.
- Alternative Customer parking on highway does not remove this 'off-road' parking requirement.
- Conclusion: this out-of-scale/ out-of-town-centre retail development location is unsuitable.

FURTHER COMMENTS

1. S/T argues that Lowther needs "passing traffic":

'Capernaum' (his best town centre option) has same 'passing traffic' as Unit 11. on B6413.

- with great extra advantage of providing further customers from its town centre location.

2. S/T argues that 'Capernaum' car parking in front might impede re-stocking shop:

1. Accepted restocking of goods practice for town centre premises, is to load and unload outside of working hours (9-5pm) when front public car parking areas are usually empty.

2. 'Capernaum' has public off-road car parking to front; and large private car parking to rear.
3. Existing industrial Unit 11. warehouse could be retained to supply Capernaum shop.

3. S/T argues that Capernaum has unsuitable, "domestic-sized" doorway entrances.

1. Not true. Normal 'domestic-sized' entrance is 32 ins width (accepting wheelchair access). 2. 'Capernaum' has two entrances, both 36 ins width; both level entry, for handicap access.
3. Compare this with Castlegate Shop: front door 34 ins; Abbey Antiques: front door 34 ins;

4. S/T argues that Capernaum ground floor space is limited for "bulky" items use; and that stairways are 'narrow' and 'insufficient width' for taking bulky items upstairs.

1. Not true. It is normal practice for all used-furniture businesses to operate out of ordinary domestic or shop premises, with ordinary-width stairs, up which they can manoeuvre bulky items. There is no reason why Lowther cannot do the same here. (Restaurant had no problems with customers proceeding upstairs).
2. Ground floor with open-plan dining and bar area (83 sq.m) exceeds the 75 sqm. shop area presently being applied for in Unit 11. (Upstairs open-plan dining area adds extra).

5. S/T argues that refurbishment from former use as a restaurant would be 'cost prohibitive' and the premises would 'require to be rewired throughout'.

1. Not true. Refurbishment of dining areas would not be prohibitive. Normal practice for a kitchen area would to leave it as it is, and (either) place used-furniture on drapes over tables and side fittings; (or) preferably, use kitchen to open a coffee area to entice in passing trade and to encourage sales.
2. Not true needs rewiring. No evidence of electric wiring needing to be rewired throughout.
6. Not true. That former Omega and Geltsdale Carpets premises are withdrawn from offers. Former Omega Landlord has stated he undertakes to pay for all refurbishments to bring it up to date.

This analysis of defects of Lowther Sequential Test, by DML of Winged Heart, CA8 1TR. 10 Nov 2018.

Comments for Planning Application 18/0359

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0359

Address: Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR

Proposal: Change of Use Of Former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Retrospective/Revised Application)

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: we need businesses like this in Brampton. They go on about parking if that premises was used as a warehouse. They could have articulated wagons pulling up all day long and that would be bad for Brampton. A lot of the parking problems are from winged heart and the post office workers. Winged heart has a shop there and sometimes there are cars parked right over the pavement. Parking in Brampton town center is bad enough so that furniture shop is in the right place. I do not agree with the parish council because [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] have been on the council for thirteen years and I am disgusted. The parking issue is ridiculous when you look at the rest of the town. The furniture warehouse is a good little business and it would be a shame to lose it. I have spoke to other businesses and they said to me the biggest problem is winged heart.



PETER WINTER

Town Planning Services Limited

Our Ref: 18/22

Your Ref: 18/0359

Date: 14 November 2018

Richard Maunsell MA (Hons) MRTPI
Planning Officer (Development Management)
Economic Development
Carlisle City Council
Civic Centre
Carlisle
CA3 8QG

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Maunsell

**Change of use of former Gym to Warehouse/Retail Shop (Revised Retrospective Application)
Unit 11, Old Brewery Yard, Craw Hall, Brampton, CA8 1TR**

I refer to your letter of 9 November advising me of the revised Sequential Test submitted in respect of this application.

I have the following comments / observations to make on the document, which should be read in conjunction with my comments on the original document submitted on 6 November:

- The revised document contains more information than the original and has identified the vacant properties that I referred to in my submission on 6 November. However, rather than containing an objective assessment of each property, fully exploring their potential, it seems to concentrate solely on reasons why they are not considered to be acceptable to the applicant.
- An example of this is that it would appear that the applicant is rejecting out of hand any property that has more than one floor. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states, inter alia, that applicants should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale, so that opportunities to utilise suitable town centre or edge of centre sites are fully explored. In this case the applicant does not appear to be showing that required flexibility. There are examples of similar businesses operating over multi-floors within Brampton and it is evident from the available premises identified by both the applicant and myself that



PETER WINTER

Town Planning Services Limited

there is a range of suitable premises available / soon to be available to him within Brampton town centre, including Capernaum Restaurant, which has access to private parking / loading facilities.

- The application is in respect of 75 sq m of retail space, with the remainder of unit 11 (approx. 175sq m) being for Warehouse purposes. However the inference from the revised Sequential Test is that now the entire 250 sq m of the premises is required for retail purposes, making it one of the largest retail properties within Brampton.
- It is argued that the applicant requires a site with ease of parking / undercover loading and unloading. Given the inadequate nature of these arrangements at Unit 11, if the City Council was going to accept the argument that there is no suitable site within the town centre then sequentially the next best site is one of the available units on the Townfoot Industrial Estate. These are only marginally further away from the town centre and all have the perfectly adequate parking and loading arrangements. Indeed, there is already a used furniture business – Brampton Used Furniture Warehouse – operating successfully from a unit on the estate, thereby demonstrating that such a business does not need to rely on passing trade to succeed.

Paragraph 90 of the NPPF is clear that if an application for out of town centre development “fails to satisfy the Sequential Test it should be refused”. The information contained in the document provided by the applicant fails to satisfy the Sequential Test, thereby conflicting with Local Plan Policy EC6. Conversely, information provided in my assessment of 6th November and by my clients demonstrates that there are sequentially preferable sites within Brampton that are **suitable** and **available**, thereby further undermining the applicant’s submission.

It is concluded that an approval would weaken the vitality and viability of the town centre of Brampton at a time when such centres are under great threat; would set an unfortunate precedent, making it difficult to resist further applications for retail developments at the Old Brewery; and fails to satisfy the Sequential Test. All of this leads to the conclusion that the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Peter Winter MRPTI
Peter Winter Town Planning Services.



PETER WINTER

Town Planning Services Limited

Planning Application 18/0792

To

3rd Nov 18

Following our recent telephone conversation I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the Parish Councils position regarding planning applications.

We cannot approve or reject an application that is for the Planning Committee, nor do we support or disapprove of an application we can only make observations. These observations are items that we would like to bring to the attention of the Planning Officer and the Planning Committee.

Before making observations if necessary we will look at the site and in the case of a new build consider a number of points:-

- a) access to the road, traffic and parking issues
- b) design and how well it will blend with the surrounding properties, this is particularly important in an area such as ours.
- c) conservation, hedges, trees and of course drainage and water run off.
- d) any listed buildings in the vicinity.

If the application complies with the above and any other particular planning issues the Clerk will respond to the Planning Officer with 'No Observations'

If we feel that the application does not meet some of the criteria these will be pointed out, therefore a '**No Observation**' response can be read as **supporting the application**.

You were at the PC Meeting on the 12th September 18 and you would have heard me state:

I visited the site and thought that the design would fit well in the location and the Highways access concerns had been addressed. The road is little used and it is one that has to be driven with care anyway and other existing entrances are more restricted.

I also said that if all planning applications were prepared with as much care and consideration for that surrounding area life would be so much simpler.

Yours

Farlam Parish Council

From: Allan, Peter T <Peter.Allan2@cumbria.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 November 2018 07:50
To: Christopher Hardman <Christopher.Hardman@carlisle.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Application 18/0693 - J44 Carlisle

Dear Christopher,

Please could the following conditions be included:

The carriageway, footways, footpaths, cycleways etc shall be designed, constructed, drained and lit to a standard suitable for adoption and in this respect further details, including longitudinal/cross sections, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before work commences on site. No work shall be commenced until a full specification has been approved. These details shall be in accordance with the standards laid down in the current Cumbria Design Guide. Any works so approved shall be constructed before the development is complete.

Reason: *To ensure a minimum standard of construction in the interests of highway safety.
To support Local Transport Plan Policies: LD5, LD7, LD8*

Ramps shall be provided on each side of every junction to enable wheelchairs, pushchairs etc. to be safely manoeuvred at kerb lines. Details of all such ramps shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before development commences. Any details so approved shall be constructed as part of the development.

Reason: *To ensure that pedestrians and people with impaired mobility can negotiate road junctions in relative safety.
To support Local Transport Plan Policies: LD5, LD7, LD8*

Access gates, if provided, shall be hung to open inwards only away from the highway.

Reason: *In the interests of highway safety.
To support Local Transport Plan Policies: LD7, LD8*

Details of all measures to be taken by the applicant/developer to prevent surface water discharging onto or off the highway shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to development being commenced. Any approved works shall be implemented prior to the development being completed and shall be maintained operational thereafter.

Reason: *In the interests of highway safety and environmental management.
To support Local Transport Plan Policies: LD7, LD8*

Full details of the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to development being commenced. Any approved works shall be implemented prior to the development being completed and shall be maintained operational thereafter.

Reason: *In the interests of highway safety and environmental management.
To support Local Transport Plan Policies: LD7, LD8*

Full details of the surface water drainage system (incorporating SUDs features as far as practicable) and a maintenance schedule shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval prior to development being commenced. Any approved works shall be implemented prior to the development being completed and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the schedule.

Reason: *To promote sustainable development, secure proper drainage and to manage the risk of flooding and pollution. To ensure the surface water system continues to function as designed and that flood risk is not increased within the site or elsewhere.*

Before any development takes place, a plan shall be submitted for the prior approval of the local planning authority reserving adequate land for the parking of vehicles engaged in construction operations associated with the development hereby approved, and that land, including vehicular access thereto, shall be used for or be kept available for these purposes at all times until completion of the construction works.

Reason: *The carrying out of this development without the provision of these facilities during the construction work is likely to lead to inconvenience and danger to road users.
To support Local Transport Policies: LD8*

Development shall not commence until a Construction Phase Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CTMP shall include details of:

- pre-construction road condition established by a detailed survey for accommodation works within the highways boundary conducted with a Highway Authority representative; with all post repairs carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority at the applicants expense;
- details of proposed crossings of the highway verge;
- retained areas for vehicle parking, maneuvering, loading and unloading for their specific purpose during the development;
- cleaning of site entrances and the adjacent public highway;
- details of proposed wheel washing facilities;
- the sheeting of all HGVs taking spoil to/from the site to prevent spillage or deposit of any materials on the highway;
- construction vehicle routing;
- the management of junctions to and crossings of the public highway and other public rights of way/footway;
- surface water management details during the construction phase

Kind regards,

Peter Allan
Flood & Development Management Officer
Flood & Development Management

Environment & Regulatory Services | Cumbria County Council
Parkhouse Building| Baron Way | Carlisle | CA6 4SJ

t: 07884116818

www.cumbria.gov.uk

Comments for Planning Application 18/0865

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0865

Address: Aldi Stores Limited, Petteril Bank Road, Carlisle, CA1 3AG

Proposal: Extension To Rear Of Existing Store; Reconfiguration Of Car Parking Area And Additional Car Parking

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: At the moment we are objecting to the expansion of the store due to number or reason. Noise during the day, my husband works permanent nights and won't be able to sleep through the day, noise of the fans coming closer to the properties, they are already very loud and we can't sleep with windows open in the summer, the building is already close to our boundary and could affect the value of our house. There are more points to object to but these are the main ones.

Comments for Planning Application 18/0865

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0865

Address: Aldi Stores Limited, Petteril Bank Road, Carlisle, CA1 3AG

Proposal: Extension To Rear Of Existing Store; Reconfiguration Of Car Parking Area And Additional Car Parking

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application


Comment Reasons:

Comment: ALDI letter of 12/11/18 received making reference to their "attached" plan showing the revisions to the submission which address comments made during consultations - no plan attached.

email to Emma Wilson 13/11/18 for ALDI noting receipt of letter, advising no plan attached and requesting information when plan can be expected to be received.

email to Emma Wilson 13/11/18 advising I will comment on revised proposals when the drawing has been received

email to Emma Wilson


Tue, 13 Nov, 18:54 (11 hours ago)
to Emma, richard.maunsell

Hi Emma

A brief email to advise that I have returned from work today and acknowledge receipt of the letter from Simon Plumb dated 12th November.

Reference is made in the letter to Simon having "attached a revised site plan for my convenience". There is no attached plan.

Maybe the plan referred to was too large and is in a separate envelope enroute.

I will await receipt of the plan before commenting on the contents of the letter as my questions may be answered with the details on the drawing.

Please advise the date I can expect to receive the plan.

Thanks and regards

A small black rectangular box redacting a signature.A larger black rectangular box redacting an address or contact information.

Comments for Planning Application 18/0865

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0865

Address: Aldi Stores Limited, Petteril Bank Road, Carlisle, CA1 3AG

Proposal: Extension To Rear Of Existing Store; Reconfiguration Of Car Parking Area And Additional Car Parking

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Incorrect information is included in the statement of community involvement - para 3.2.2 refers to the proposed building being 2.8m away from the boundary fence of the residential properties when drawing 0305 SK55 dated 23/10/18 clearly shows it to be of the order of 1.8m when the eaves overhang is considered

Similarly in para 4.71 of the same document reference is made to the overbearing nature of the proposal being 0.5m above the existing boundary fence. This was demonstrated at the site meeting to be of the order of a metre above the boundary fence at 82 Cavaghan Gardens and in excess of that at properties closer to London Road due to the topography and ground falling away - consequently the issues relating to shadow increase the closer to London Road the matter is considered.

Comments for Planning Application 18/0865

Application Summary

Application Number: 18/0865

Address: Aldi Stores Limited, Petteril Bank Road, Carlisle, CA1 3AG

Proposal: Extension To Rear Of Existing Store; Reconfiguration Of Car Parking Area And Additional Car Parking

Case Officer: Richard Maunsell

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Comment

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Further objection relating to reduced security / potential nuisance from relationship of the proposed retaining wall, integrated handrail and relative ease for someone to spring from the handrail onto the gutter of the extended building - the section on drawing 0305 SK55 of 23/10/18 clearly shows the relative dimensions and proximity to boundary fence.

At the site meeting on 7/11/18 the project architect commented that the proposal was not designed to meet "Secured by Design" standards.

Correspondence with ALDI on the matter as below:-

1/ In your letter of 17/10/18 you advised me the store would be 2.8m away. From today's section the dimension is more like 1.8m when the eaves detail is considered - am restricted to phone access - will forward screen shots shortly which illustrate this - ref 1

2/ The proposed detail with assumed handrail mounted on top of dwarf retaining wall presents the prospect and inviting challenge for youths to balance on the handrail to gain access to Aldi roof. The current nuisance of youths on the chiller unit enclosure would be insignificant compared to the prospect of marauding on the main roof structure - ref 2

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Tue, 6 Nov, 13:56 (8 days ago)

[REDACTED]

Dear Emma

Thank you for forwarding the drawings which disturb me further and reinforce my belief that this is an inappropriate and ill conceived extension for the following reasons

1/ In your letter of 17/10/18 you advised me the store would be 2.8m away. From todays section the dimension is more like 1.8m when the eaves detail is considered - am restricted to phone access - will forward screen shots shortly which illustrate this - ref 1

2/ The proposed detail with assumed handrail mounted on top of dwarf retaining wall presents the prospect and inviting challenge for youths to balance on the handrail to gain access to Aldi roof. The current nuisance of youths on the chiller unit enclosure would be insignificant compared to the prospect of marauding on the main roof structure - ref 2

3/ The topography is such that the closer to London Road that properties are then the greater will be the increased shadow impact

4/ I note you have not made reference to my offer to install a profile to indicate the height of the gutter and wonder if you have made arrangements to do this?

I consider it useful to hear your detailed explanation of the issues raised above at a site meeting as I consider your team are making this up as they go along rather than come forward with a detailed proposal and engage in a meaningful consultative process - this view having previously made to you.

Screen shots to follow

[REDACTED]

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: Emma Wilson

Date: Tue, 6 Nov 2018, 12:55

Subject: RE: Aldi Carlisle

[REDACTED]

Cc: richard.maunsell@carlisle.gov.uk [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

Please see attached the following documents which we intend to discuss with you tomorrow:

Proposed site plan

Proposed site section at 74 Cavaghan Gardens (please bear in mind that we do not have the exact topology beyond the Aldi site boundary)

Proposed elevations

Proposed car park site section

Proposed landscaping plan

The purpose of our visit to talk through our revisions to the proposed extension, which include:

Removal of the existing refrigeration unit and repositioning of an upgraded refrigeration unit adjacent to the loading bay

Fencing installed between the rear boundary and the rear of the store

Installation of a 2-meter acoustic fence around the north and west boundaries of the car parking area

Planting between the site boundary and the car parking area

Please do let us know if you are still interested in us visiting to discuss our proposal.

I hope you find the information helpful, and my contact details are below.

Kind regards,

Emma Wilson

For and on behalf of Aldi Stores Ltd

Emma Wilson
Account Manager

Chancery Place, 10th Floor, 50 Brown Street | | Manchester | M2 2JT

D: 0161 359 4109

O: 0161 359 4100

M: 07880 380 907

E: emma.wilson@becg.com